DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 579 UD 015 407

AUTHOR Scott, Robert A.
TITLE The Opening of Admissions: Implications for Policies and Procedures.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the International Conference on Higher Education (3d, University of Lancaster, England, September 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Case Studies (Education); *College Admission; Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Opportunities; *Equal Education; Higher Education; *Open Enrollment; Universal Education; Universities
IDENTIFIERS Chicago; Illinois; Roosevelt University

ABSTRACT

This address focuses on the topic of open admissions and its implications for policies and procedures. A discussion, defining terms like excellence, equality, and open admissions, initiates a brief examination of issues such as institution-based and individual-based barriers to posesecondary schooling, the organization of college admissions--its trends and pressures--and the widening of access to further schooling. The results of this discussion are subsequently utilized to examine a single institution's policies and procedures. In Roosevelt University, a case study for open admission is presented through a detailed description of the setting, organization, admissions overview, admissions and barriers, and a measurement of the degree of openness. Roosevelt University is said to represent a notable example of a private college doing its part to effect dramatic social change in the opening of admissions, by showing that policies can be fair, and procedures both humane and efficient--while at the same time accomplishing the goals for which they are established. The key to the opening of admissions is said to consist in the guarantee of mobility, not in the promise of placement into a program that is beyond the scope of one's training and grasp. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110579

The Opening of Admissions: Implications for Policies and Procedures

Presented to the Working Party on
Access and Structure
Third International Conference on Higher Education
1st-5th September 1975
The University, Lancaster, United Kingdom

Robert A. Scott, Cornell University

The paper examines briefly the issues of equality and excellence, the barriers to post-secondary schooling, the organization of college admissions, and the widening of access to further schooling. It then utilizes these results in an intensive examination of a single institution's policies and procedures.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015407

The Opening of Admissions:
Implications for Policies and Procedures

EXCELLENCE. EQUALITY.

"Open Admissions" is the most recent expression of the time-honored and still dynamic ideal of equal opportunity. In libraries around the world, shelves reach to ceilings with references to the forces and indicators of the steady movement toward this goal, especially in educational opportunity. The course from aristocratic to meritocratic to egalitarian admissions philosophies has been charted.[1]

At no time have these democratic sentiments been more alive and effective than in the United States during the past one hundred years, a period marked by the Morrill Land Grant Act (1862) on the one end and by the City University of New York's Open Admissions Program on the other. In the 1960's and early 1970's especially, the theme of equal educational opportunity came to be honored as the fulfillment of a national dream.

On an abstract level, there was little dissent to this trend. However, when it was time to honor the pledge of equal opportunity, several long-standing arguments heated up. The basic question behind them was, "Higher education for whom?". Some said that the opportunity for education after secondary school should be based solely on academic merit. Others, like a recent Michigan governor, said that "the education of a citizenry is fundamentally a state responsibility, based upon the belief that society rather than the individual is the primary beneficiary of the value of education,"[2] and therefore it should be available to all who want it.

Thinkers in the first tradition include Thomas Jefferson, who, in 1778, proposed an educational system in which a "national aristocracy" of talent would rise to the top, permitting

> "...the best geniuses...[to] be raked from the rubbish annually."[3]

Another is Charles Eliot, who in his 1869 inaugural address at Harvard said,

> "The community does not owe superior [i.e., higher] education to all children, but only to the elite."[4]

In more recent times, Sir Eric Ashby, has written,

> "All civilized countries...depend upon a thin clear stream of excellence to provide new ideas, new techniques, and the statesmanlike treatment of complex social and political problems. Without the renewal of this excellence, a nation can drop to mediocrity in a generation... the highly gifted student...needs to be treated as <u>elite</u>."[5]

Spokesman for egalitarian/ism in education argue that everyone, not just an elite, should have access to schooling after high school. In February, 1970, the Board of Trustees of the National Urban League asserted,

> "...that our nation's colleges and universities must adopt or reestablish policies of open admission and direct both public and private funds into

> creating opportunities whereby any person
> who has completed requirements for graduation
> from an accredited high school or its equivalent
> will be assured access to higher education."[6]

These positions represent two schools of thought, one honoring what adherents consider to be excellence, the other honoring equality. One might conclude after reading these statements that the notions are mutually exclusive. They need not be. Excellence is not the possession of any one field, or skill, or virtue, but exists in many varieties. There is excellence in computation and excellence in conjugation; excellence that requires skill and excellence that involves being a certain kind of person.[7]

Excellence is the result of superior attainment in meeting distinctive goals. "It may be experienced at every level and in every serious kind of higher education,"[8] said John Gardner in his superb little book on this topic. Excellence is not possessed solely by any single college or set of institutions, but may be found wherever people and institutions strive for the highest standards in whatever they attempt.

Given this definition of excellence, one might conclude that it can exist in egalitarian settings. This may be true, but before such a conclusion can be drawn, one must set parameters for "equality" just as we have for "excellence." Equality implies different conditions to different people. Therefore, before discussing it in terms of higher education, we should decide what we mean by equality.

It has been a tenet of democratic thought that "all men are created equal." Then disagreement sets in. Some argue that there are and should be no differences between men; that all people should be treated and respected equally because no person is better than another in any dimension. Jacksonian democracy and the deliberations of student radicals shared this view. Others, who agree with the fundamental tenet, have a different conception of equality. They believe that all people are equal before the law in their possession of certain legal, civil, and political rights; that everyone is equally important as a person, and that equality of treatment and consideration should be granted to everyone regardless of station; that equality of opportunity to change one's condition should be the norm.[9] However, this view also recognizes that equality of opportunity is affected by one's circumstances, and that perfect equality of circumstances cannot be guaranteed. People are not equal in talents and motivation; consequently, they are not equal in achievement. We cannot guarantee equality of results. As long as some problems require trained minds for their solution, and as long as some people have the aptitude and motivation to learn complicated procedures, we will always have differing results from differing efforts. This does not mean that some people have greater intrinsic worth than others, but only that equality of achievement cannot be guaranteed. We can promise equality of opportunity--e.g., access to additional schooling--but we cannot promise that everyone who tries will earn a degree in Physics or Accounting, unless we are willing to reduce the standards for them to the lowest common denominator.

DEFINING OPENED ADMISSIONS

These positions do not exhaust the arguments pro and con; they are only representative. They help illustrate that part of the problem with the debate about open admissions, a part not often faced either by advocates or opponents, is the definition of terms. For example, equal opportunity for what education? Do all spokesmen mean the same thing when they talk about it? Probably not. Proponents usually include a wide range of learning activities, traditional academic studies as well as career programs, offered by universities, four-year colleges, community

colleges, and proprietary schools owned by private businesses. Opponents usually seem to be trying to preserve the sanctity of traditional colleges and universities from the masses of students, who, in previous years and under other philosophies, would not even have considered post-secondary education.

A more general problem of definition concerns the term "open admissions." It implies a dichotomy: open admissions and closed admissions. If admissions is now "open," it must have been closed at one time.[10] The term conveys no feeling of a continuum on which we can calibrate the degree of openness. For this reason, I prefer to say "opened," "opening," or "expanded" admissions.

For this discussion, the term opened admissions represents the philosophy that anyone may find access to additional schooling beyond the secondary level. "Open admissions," the popular term used to convey this thought, is an administrative label used to identify the attempts made to eliminate the effects of traditional barriers to post-secondary learning opportunities, so that every person may pursue the education or training for which he or she is prepared. Note the words, "attempts made to eliminate": Increasing admissions opportunities is an organic process, not the result of a mechanical thrust or fiat, although certain stages in the process may be forced by student and community activism, as at the City University of New York. Second, the term used is "post-secondary learning," not "higher" education, because bachelor's degree programs are not the only opportunities either available or important. Career programs in health care, food processing, and auto mechanics are also important. Third, the emphasis is on *may* progress, not *will* progress. The opening of admissions should expand the number of options available to people, not simply extend the length of the lockstep of earlier school years. Universal access should not mean universal attendance. The goal is to provide freedom of choice for all students. Traditional students should be as free to delay college as new students are to begin. Fourth, the definition includes both traditional education and career training, a further emphasis on the second point. A Bachelor of Arts is neither the only symbol of excellence, nor the best form of education for every student to pursue, given the ranges of people's interests and society's needs. And entrepreneurs, idealists, and the career-oriented are all motivated to satisfy needs. Last, note the expression, "for which he or she is prepared." This is not meant to be a covert form of exclusion.* People should find it possible to progress from course to course and program to program according to their interests and competence in the prerequisite stage. The student who is deficient in mathematics but wants to study engineering or accounting should be counseled into the appropriate preparatory course, not simply admitted, or denied admission, or told to find another field of study. Meritocratic admissions standards ignore students' needs and honor the institution's notion of "standards."[11] Opened admissions should help students satisfy their desires to learn.

THE BARRIERS TO ADMISSION

Richard Ferrin, in Barriers to Universal Higher Education, surveyed twenty years of literature on barriers to college attendance and formulated four categories into which most barriers seem to fall: academic, financial, geographic, and motivational.[12] While Ferrin's four-part model of barriers provides a convenient display for their study, I found that the list of barriers was incomplete and that the

---

*One of the reasons some people may object to this definition is that any "no" is taken as a final roadblock, another barrier, not a temporary and necessary diversion. Until they believe that the door will be opened after they have completed the prerequisites, they will pound on the door they want open, and promises will not be heard.

categories needed refinement. It is not enough to label a cell or bin "academic" and fill it with some academically-related barriers based in post-secondary institutions and others based outside this set of forces. Therefore, I multiplied the four categories by two dimensions, one to include the four categories of barriers and aspects of them that are related more to institutions than to students, e.g., curricula offerings; and the others to include aspects of the four categories of barriers that are related more to individuals than to institutions, e.g., curricula interests. There is some overlap between the two dimensions, of course, just as there is some between the four categories. The eight cells are shown in Figure I.

Academic barriers, especially the effects of socio-economic status and test scores on the sorting of students, and the tracking of students in secondary schools, have been studied extensively.[13] Financial barriers have also received a great deal of attention, although individual barriers such as foregone income have not been studied as much as the effects of tuition charges. Geographic barriers have received some attention, especially from Anderson et al, Ferrin, and Willingham, who have done studies on the location of colleges and the proximity of open access institutions to large segments of the population.[14] However, the problems of psychological distance from the collegiate culture have not been studied as thoroughly. Nor have the barriers to physically handicapped students received much attention. The need for financial aid support by part-time students has also been generally ignored.

Educators have written at length about the influence of parental and school encouragement on student achievement and aspirations. However, they have generally neglected the need for day-care centers, the special needs of older, returning students, and the requirements of those who are the victims of previously-rated morality, such as those who have been in jail, or who have pursued a curriculum that is not preparatory to college study.

TRENDS AND PRESSURES IN ADMISSIONS

To understand more fully the progress in overcoming these barriers, we need first to examine several trends in admissions. The movement from aristocratic to meritocratic to egalitarian admissions philosophies has been explained well by Patricia Cross.[15] Another historical comparison, however, has not been made. Some commentators say that "opened admissions" is no different from the Land Grant philosophy which provided in the late 19th century low cost institutions for the children of the industrial classes. Lowering the tuition costs of higher education was an important first step, but it did not diminish the effects of other barriers. Land Grant colleges admitted nearly all applicants until the 1950's when many of these schools found that they had to use admissions criteria in order to admit only those for whom they had room. State colleges, which for years had been admitting every high school graduate applicant, suddenly began turning people away. They had failed to correlate the increase in high school graduates with the need for more college spaces.

There are five major differences between present egalitarian trends and Land Grant college practices. First, placement in appropriate courses, not just access to higher education, is of major concern. Many colleges tell prospective students about the programs available and try to help find suitable matches between interests and opportunities. Second, the revolving doors of the Land Grant colleges are being held open by tutoring, counseling, and transitional courses. Students are being helped in their attempts to cope with institutions; they are not just given access one term and flunked out the next. There is a concern for the proper evaluation of strengths and deficiencies, and the beginnings of a strong emphasis on the value that the educational experience adds to one's life. Third, admission

FIGURE I

Barriers to Postsecondary Schooling

	Institution-based Barriers	Individual-based Barriers
ACADEMIC	Overly restrictive admission and graduation requirements in secondary schools; post-secondary school admission requirements; entrance examinations; limited post-secondary curricula; general education requirements; course prerequisites; bureaucratic procedures that limit accessibility; few guidance or informational services; no developmental program or transitional time for adjustment; restricted range of times and variety of course offerings; the size, quality, and teaching style of the faculty; little opportunity for students to progress at their own pace.	Early decisions on placement or "track" in high school; high school achievement; curricula interests; non-standard preparation; "marginal" or low aptitude scores; perceptions about "college."
FINANCIAL	Tuition, fees, room, board, and other charges; differential tuition for out-of-state students; limited financial aid or other subsidy.	Foregone income; reduced contribution to family; no family contribution; limited opportunity for summer earnings or year-round job; fear of excessive debt.
GEOGRAPHICAL	Distance in miles and minutes to campus; transportation sources limited.	Psychological distance; different culture; afraid to leave old patterns and friends.
MOTIVATIONAL	Lack of encouragement from teachers and guidance counselors; limited information and guidance provided; bureaucratic barriers such as limited part-time student opportunities available, applications due very early; attitudes toward "previously-rated" morality; restrictions based on age, sex, race, religion; attitudes toward residency and transfer of credit.	Lack of encouragement from peers and parents; lack of confidence, low self-concept; no feeling of "payoff" or worthwhileness of further schooling; need for day care or special physical facilities; crowded campus; perceived campus "press"; desire by upper middle class students not to be downwardly mobile; feelings by lower middle class students that upward mobility is not a realistic aspiration.

is not limited to a "college-age" population of recent secondary school graduates. Fourth, Land Grant colleges were built in rural areas away from population centers, and charges for room and board, in many cases, offset the advantages of low tuition. Now, there is concern for the accessibility of campuses, and financial aid according to the need for it. Finally, open-door community colleges provide access, especially for part-time students, in a way that was never available before, even with the early Land Grant movement.

Sir Eric Ashby has identified three major forces acting on higher education. These forces are consumer demand, i.e., the amount and kind of education the public wants; manpower needs, i.e., the needs of society for highly trained people and the jobs that influence students' choice of studies; and patrons' influences, i.e., the consequences of donors' or legislators' decisions to finance or not to fund various aspects of the educational system.[16] During the years immediately after Sputnik, these forces spurred on the dramatic increase in attention paid to secondary and higher learning. These forces and the Civil Rights movement combined to encourage minorities and their advocates to seek the college places necessary for jobs and upward mobility. Education was viewed not only as a matter of consumption, but also as an investment, both for the individual and for society.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 expanded access further with loans and grants, but the assassination in 1968 of the Reverand Martin Luther King is more frequently cited as the public event that shook the consciousness of the land and inspired many predominantly white colleges aggressively to increase their recruiting of Black and and other minority students. (minority, low-income, disabled, etc.)

Recruiting the "new"/students to higher learning was difficult; it involved a substantial change in admissions strategy, and admitting them raised new issues and controversies about admissions criteria and the qualifications for college-level study. Aptitude test scores and high school achievement levels, both highly correlated with family socio-economic status, were lower for the new recruits than the norms established by previous competitors for college spaces. To ease the transition between secondary school and college, and to help insure the success of the students admitted, numerous special summer and year-long "bridge" programs were established in both high schools and colleges.

These new pressures and the changes in both population statistics and public accountability have helped heighten the degree of specialization in admissions offices. While all admissions offices are concerned with enrollment, public relations, and admissions policy, these are not the primary activities that define the tone of an office. These major jobs are recruiting, selecting, counseling, and the management of student records and data. All campuses are concerned with these core tasks, but most admissions offices choose only one or two as a dominant activity. The choice depends upon the type of institution and its stage of development. Private colleges and universities tend to spend more time recruiting than public institutions do, and public institutions are more often than private ones engaged in the sophisticated management of student records and data. Only a few large private universities would claim this as a primary responsibility.

Student recruiting is a major activity primarily for small private liberal arts colleges which have traditionally been faced with competition from the more prestigious private and the lower cost public institutions. Recruiting involves visits to secondary schools and alumni groups, placing advertising in newspapers and magazines, contracting for posters, catalogues and brochures, developing market plans for finding students who are likely to have the profile of current successful undergraduates, and the sundry other activities that are involved in identifying a pool of students and trying to sell them on the virtues and opportunities of one's home institution. Public emphasis on expanding admissions opportunities has resulted in more attention being given to recruiting by all colleges.

Other colleges have sufficient numbers of applicants but want to be sure that they select from that group the most able students. Although selection procedures vary by institution, typically selection is done by the director of admissions, or possibly the director and his staff. However, as schools ascend the status ladder, there is a strong likelihood that the faculty will be involved in selection. At one level, faculty serve on a screening committee that reviews the difficult cases of children of alumni and friends. At another level, the faculty is involved in reading and voting on all candidates, not just the problem cases. As demands for expanded access increase, faculty and staff devote more attention to the establishment of new criteria for selection.

Still other institutions spend most of their admissions time counseling students about placement and curricula opportunities. These activities are shared as a primary task by both unselective open-door community colleges and the most selective private colleges and universities. The former operate this way as a matter of public service; the latter because they have an abundance of highly qualified applicants and want students to make their college choices for educational reasons.

The fourth category of admissions office is concerned primarily with the management of student records and data. As mentioned previously, this activity is considered most important by large public and some private universities, and by the central offices of public systems of higher education. (The increasing use by private colleges of federal and state financial aid funds, and the concomitant reports required, result in all colleges being concerned with student data management.) Typically, in these cases, the director or dean of admissions is also the university registrar and is engaged in significant levels of institutional research, especially that involving enrollment projections, space and facilities usage, and the scheduling of rooms and examinations. The emphasis of these offices is on computer-generated reports for management planning and decision making, and as a means of accountability to public sponsors.

The different types of admissions offices are responses to the varied pressures on institutions during these days of dynamic change. The case study will illustrate one office's response.

The barriers to enrollment are formidable, but there has been progress in reducing them. It is clear though, that they are objectionable to different groups for different reasons. Some are concerned about manpower requirements; they want to be sure that enough trained people are available for industry and government. Others are moved by their consciences to object to the gap between national ideals and reality for segments of the population. Finally, others are driven to protest the barriers by the desire for a better job, higher income, and an improved quality of life. In our culture, education provides the pass to those goals. Most attempts to overcome barriers try to attack several at once: motivation and geographic barriers overlap; overcoming the academic barriers but not the financial ones would help few.

Much of the attention given to these barriers has been on the national level, and the data sometimes lose their poignancy when there are no personalities attached. To overcome this obstacle, we will discuss the barriers to access and how they are being overcome by looking intensively at one case. Since so much attention has been given to the national attempts at overcoming barriers and to the City University of New York's Open Admissions Program, which is only one attempt at expanding access, is should be of interest to consider the case of another institution that is committed to the opening of admissions.

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY: A CASE STUDY

In arguing for the opening of admissions to higher education, John Holt refers to libraries, museums, and concert halls as appropriate analogues to the ideal college or university. The former make no judgments about admission, he says, and neither should the latter.[17]

At first glance, Roosevelt University is a fitting example for Holt's beguiling description. It is housed in the same ten-story building as the Auditorium Theatre, Chicago's distinguished 4,000 seat concert hall designed by Adler and Sullivan, which opened in 1889. Located at the corner of Michigan Avenue and Congress Parkway, the Theatre is a central turret on the eastern border of the city, and looks out over Grant Park to the Chicago harbor and Lake Michigan.

Even if Holt's analogy is strained, Roosevelt is a striking case to consider. Unlike most catalogue and founding statement rhetoric that pays homage to abstract verities, Roosevelt's "manifesto" is simple, direct, and active. It promises excellence, academic freedom, "educational opportunities to persons of both sexes and of various races on equal terms," faculty governance, concern for the city, and assurance that "from the standpoint of location, time, and cost, its educational facilities [will be] made as accessible as possible to all qualified students."[18]

Roosevelt's founding promises reveal the reasons for its birth. In 1945, the president, dean of the faculties, and some sixty-eight faculty members of the Central YMCA College of Chicago resigned in a controversy with the governing board over academic freedom and discrimination.[19] The group joined together in this spirit to found a new college. At first, the name Thomas Jefferson College was chosen, but the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt moved the founders' to adopt his name.

Classes at Roosevelt College began in September, 1945, with more than 1,300 students in temporary quarters. Accreditation came quickly, in March, 1946, because Roosevelt was really the continuation of a predecessor institution; faculty, administrative staff, student body, and library had been moved virtually intact.

Enrollment swelled with World War II veterans funded by the G. I. Bill, new patrons joined the ranks of friends of the college (although its endowment never swelled as quickly as enrollment), and in 1947 it purchased and moved into the historic Auditorium Building. Within three years, Roosevelt had an enrollment of over 5,000 students. In 1954, the College became a university.

The radical fervor of thoses early days, thirty years ago, exists now in subdued form. The University is no longer seen as a "hotbed for commies," but as a liberal place with flexible ideas; twenty-fifth anniversary plaques hang in the offices of the few "founding fathers" who have not moved on or retired, and the remaining Young Turks are now the Established Order.

Unlike many collegiate statements of philosophy, Roosevelt's carries a vision that defined its role and by the hard work of dedicated people became its mission. In The Distinctive College,[20] Burton Clark elaborates his theory of the stages through which a vision must move on its way to becoming a saga. Although his cases do not include Roosevelt, she is on her way to meeting the criteria. The early vision imbued the mission with such energy and clarity that its achievements have nearly become legend with a life of their own, somewhat separate from reality. This takes on special meaning at Roosevelt when one tries to distinguish between flexibility based on a liberal philosophy and flexibility based on economic expendiency and a desire for survival.

The distinction occurred to this writer because Roosevelt's programs and structure seemed so much more than other colleges' to be near the far end of the continuum called the opening of admissions, and Roosevelt was considering even more changes. I began to doubt its sincerity. Scores of panels on higher education had urged institutions to become more flexible and to market their programs, and hundreds of colleges had begun to change in response to "consumer desires" and the need for more students in order to balance budgets. But further investigation revealed that Roosevelt had not changed for these reasons, or at least not for these reasons alone. Its changes were sturctural and based in its philosophy; access was always being broadened, but not at the expense of its standards. While other colleges have been dropping their English departments

and substituting programs in "communications," for example, Roosevelt has maintained in a very good English department one of the most rigorous writing requirements in the country.

The results of this cursory examination into the basis for flexibility convinced me that Roosevelt would be a good case to explore for the purposes of this study.

THE SETTING

The main entrance to Roosevelt reminds the visitor of Grand Central Station in New York. Although the lobby is not as large as Grand Central, its style is of the same period. The ceiling is high and the fixtures massive. Two elevators give to their riders temporary relief from the sounds of traffic and trains.

The lobby has a newsstand, information counter, announcements board, and colorful brochures housed in racks of modern design. The Summer School sign proclaims air conditioned rooms as one of its features.

The announcements board and the elevators underscore the fact that Roosevelt University comprises one building. This unique feature and the school's location offer both important conveniences and interesting problems. Alyce E. Pasca, one of the founding faculty and Director of the Counseling and Testing Service, describes the former hotel building with its World War II surplus furniture as a symbol of upward mobility, and a conduit for rumors. The corridors create an excellent "word of mouth" circuit, she says. Students and faculty compliment the sturdiness of the thick walls in the original parts of the building -- and contrast them to the walls in modern high schools -- but deride the construction and colors in its newer parts.[21]

The location of the building is excellent; it is convenient to all major transportation routes. However, this convenience carries a problem with it. The boulevards and railroad tracks that bring students to Roosevelt also go by it, and the sounds of traffic, parades, and the elevated train all hinder concentration.

These are the features of an urban institution, by which I mean not only that it is located in a city, but also that it serves both city dwellers and commuters. Through flexible class scheduling and special degree programs, Roosevelt fulfills its mission of teaching those who will teach and otherwise work in the city. It is also a major cultural center for music and theatre.

Our definition of urban institution also leads to the offering of classes at the other end of the commuter line, in the suburbs. But most of the students are downtown, and they are 15% foreign, 26% Black, and often part-time in status. Many of them study after work; at 6:00 pm the elevators and halls are jammed with students eager for the credits that lead to new jobs, promotions, and raises.[22]

THE ORGANIZATION

In 1975, Roosevelt offered approximately fifty fields of concentration through the departments and programs of the five undergraduate divisions. The seven instructional colleges or divisions are: College of Arts and Sciences, Walter E. Heller College of Business Administration, College of Continuing Education, Chicago Musical College, College of Education, Graduate Division, and Labor Education Division, which offers special courses for union officers and members. The nearly 350 faculty members, more than half of whom are full-time, teach approximately 7,000 full and part-time students.

There is a symbiotic relationship between a curriculum and its students. At Roosevelt, as in nature, this relationship is one of give and take; the direction of one is determined in large part by the movement of the other. For an urban institution,

this means that the courses, the faculty, the schedule, the services, and the problems of administration are influenced by its particular studentry, which is attracted by the possibilities of the school's academic environment and philosophy. The dynamics at Roosevelt have resulted in a shift away from traditional programs and full-time students to continuing education, general studies, graduate training, and part-time students.[23] The "new students" to higher education may be found at Roosevelt.

The trend away from the College of Arts and Sciences is severe, and more so than the decline in total applications. From 1964 to 1973, total fall term applications to Arts and Sciences fell from 2259 to 924, or 53%, while total applications to the University dropped 12%. Fall enrollment of new students in Arts and Sciences fell 53%, while total enrollment of new students fell 21%.[24]

Two questions emerge from this simple analysis. First, has enrollment in Arts and Sciences courses dropped as severely as enrollment in the College? Second, can one expect enrollment in Continuing Education and Graduate Study, two areas of dramatic growth, to grow sufficiently to compensate for the decline in Arts and Sciences?

The answer to the first question is, "No". Since many of the courses taken by General Studies students were liberal arts courses, enrollment in them has not fallen as precipitously as enrollment in the College as a whole. However, "enrollment" can be a misleading statistic, because unless definitions are made clear, one might compare a total of full-time students with a total of part-time students. And this leads us to the answer to the second question. Even with an increase in enrollment of 400% since 1966, and projections for continued increases, Continuing Education alone cannot be seen as offering the possibility of compensating on a one-to-one basis for the decline in Arts and Science enrollment. For one thing, Continuing Education students earn fewer total credits at Roosevelt because they enter with advanced standing earned elsewhere. In recent years, almost one-half of the credits applied toward graduation requirements had been earned elsewhere.[25] Only 30 credits toward a degree must be earned at Roosevelt. Second, most Continuing Education and graduate students are enrolled part-time.

Over a three year period, total head-count enrollment has just about stabilized.[26] The full-time equivalent is about 4200 students.[27] However, the number of credit hours taken by students has declined as the number of part-time students has increased.[28]

The most rapid expansion of enrollments has been in Continuing Education and graduate students. From Fall 1968 to Fall 1973, total enrollment in Continuing Education grew from 320 to 1096 students. Graduate enrollment increased from about 25% of the total in 1971-72 to 32% in 1974.[29]

Continuing Education and graduate students together offer significant opportunities for maintaining total enrollment, but with students whose age, attitudes and ambitions are different: they are generally older, more mature, and oriented toward careers other than teaching. These changes are already taking place. Ten years ago, Roosevelt attracted largely middle- and upper-middle class Jewish students from the North Suburban and Southshore areas of Chicago. Middle class Black students made up 10 to 15% of the student body. Few other minorities or Catholics were enrolled. Little financial aid was available, and the studentry was typically collegiate in age. By 1973, shifts in Roosevelt's population could be discerned. Fewer middle-class students were enrolling because financial aid need calculations tended to divert middle-income family students to lower tuition state-supported institutions. However, the advent of need-based financial aid led to an increase of lower-income students, which resulted in a rise in enrollment of Black and Roman Catholic European ethnic group students. North Suburban students were replaced by those from the western suburbs and parochial schools. At the same time, the number of part-time students increased and the average age of students rose to 25.[30] This last change is probably the result of Roosevelt's liberal policies on the transfer and earning of non-traditional credit, and its attraction to adult students who want a senior college

atmosphere, not the "high school" atmosphere perceived by them to exist at many community colleges. One benefit of this is that the graduation rate at Roosevelt is 30% higher than the national average.[31]

One of the reasons for the decline in freshman applications may have been the shift in population areas from which Roosevelt has traditionally recruited high school graduates. The number of applicants from the middle and upper-middle income North Suburban communities has declined, while the number from the less affluent western suburbs has increased. At the same time, the number of students from parochial and private schools, and out-of-Chicago area schools, has increased. The number from Chicago proper has stayed about the same, even though both the number and percentage of 16 to 19 year olds enrolled in Chicago schools has increased over the last decade.[32] These data suggest that the primary reason for the enrollment decline is not population shift, but some other cause. The competition from low-cost community colleges, which multiplied in number during the 1960's, is probably it. Many of the students who might have attended Roosevelt as freshman in the past now enter as transfers.

These changes in students enrolled have resulted in changes other than in the selection of curricula. For example, fewer students are going on to traditional fields of graduate study. (However, almost 45% go on to professional programs.) This means that in the current "buyers market" for instructors, when Roosevelt is trying to hire the "best" faculty, and these are usually those with the most scholarly orientations, it is enrolling fewer students who want to pursue careers in the image of their teachers. It is too early to tell what major dysfunctions will result from this, but already a few problems can be identified. The tensions that result from a change in power are reported to exist in the relations between the "old guard" faculty of Arts and Sciences and those in other divisions who emphasize new fields, new styles, and testing for competence rather than classroom teaching. However, this is not a major problem, and Roosevelt's tradition of flexibility and adaptability, and its unique faculty governance structure suggest to this writer that the tensions will not soon be compounded into something more serious. In the first place, the faculty at large is the faculty of Continuing Education (only a few appointments are specifically in it); and in the second place, the curriculum committee in Continuing Education is elected in large part by the Councils of the other Colleges.[33] Only if there are changes in these areas is the tension likely to increase.

There is reason to believe, though, that there will be changes in this arrangement. The College of Continuing Education is the "growing edge" of Roosevelt. It is the source of much recent innovation and of sorely needed enrollment growth. It pioneers new methods that other departments eventually adopt. As an interesting and rapidly growing part of the university, Continuing Education will be held up with pride to outside sources of support, and its needs for more faculty and space will be satisfied. The result will probably be more tension unless the traditional faculty recognizes that Continuing Education is performing an important function for both its students and for Roosevelt.

The College of Continuing Education relies heavily on both diagnostic and remedial work, and on placement and proficiency examinations which are used to accelerate students to junior year-level study. It tries to free students from the constraints of time and space by offering courses on and off campus, weekdays and weekends (including Sunday), daytime and evening, and by making use of examinations as explained above. The College enrolls about one-half of its students at night; about 40% of its students are Black; and about 50% of its graduates continue their studies at the master's level.[34]

The more immediate problems at Roosevelt are administrative and structural rather than with the faculty. For example, if the staff of the University works from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, who will serve the evening students and faculty? Who will advise and counsel these students about course selection and other academic matters? Who will provide faculty with the clerical support required for most courses? Compensatory time off

during the day for those who will work evenings is not an adequate solution because the result is a reduced staff during the day. And during a time of economic cutbacks, the University cannot hire more staff. However, without more help in the evenings, the flexibility and attractiveness of evening courses is diminished.

Another problem with evening courses is their scheduling. Just as schedule conflicts occur in the traditional college on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday mornings at 10:00, non-traditional students and evening courses jam up at 6:00 p.m. The halls are crowded and empty classrooms scarce as evening students try to fit in one or two courses after work and before it is too late to walk safely to the bus or train for the ride home.[35]

The faculty at Roosevelt appears to be quite good, and comprised of many devoted teachers who can also do productive research. Professor Otto Wirth, one of the University's senior and most distinguished faculty, emphasized to me Roosevelt's desire to hire teachers who are "interested and concerned with students." "Can he generate the enthusiasm of his field to his students?" is the major question to be asked before hiring someone.[36] Although it is not a research university, a large percentage of faculty have doctorates, a goodly number publish books and articles, and numerous grants are awarded to them for teaching and other innovations. However, the graduate schools and publishers of many of the faculty are located in Chicago, which makes one wonder whether the faculty is hired with PhD's in progress and if the publications are based on dissertation research. For example, in two large departments, Math and Sociology, every advanced degree had been awarded by a university in Illinois, with the University of Chicago and Northwestern leading the list.[37] In Management and Personnel Administration, and Marketing and Advertising, areas of considerable growth in student interest, 13 of 19 advanced degrees are from Illinois institutions, and 10 of the 13 are from Chicago institutions.[38] Also, in a recent listing by the President of twelve books by Roosevelt faculty, eight were published by university presses in Illinois or by Xerox and University microfilms. The point of this analysis is not to denegrate the achievements of Roosevelt faculty, but to indicate that they are probably not the mobile cosmopolitans of their disciplines.

One measure of a faculty's status is the number of doctorates held. By hand count of the faculty listed in the 1974-75 Bulletin, 157 of 266 Roosevelt faculty (60%) hold a doctorate, including the J.D. and M.D. degrees. The national average for four year colleges is 41.7%.[39]

Another measure is salary. According to the most recent report of faculty salaries compiled by the AAUP,[40] Roosevelt's salaries are about average for its class of institution (IIA). Full professor and associate professor salaries are close to the 50th percentile level; assistant professor's are near the 60th percentile; and instructor's salaries are at the 30th percentile level.

In another area, Roosevelt faculty is almost without peer. Since its founding, the faculty of Roosevelt has been involved in the governance of the institution. Not only are faculty elected members of the Board of Trustees, but also they have a significant voice in other matters. They confirm, by a two-thirds vote, or deny appointments as Dean. Every three years, the deans and president must submit to a vote of confidence by the faculty. Each college has an active executive committee that includes elected faculty representatives. But, perhaps the most unusual body is the Budget Committee, half of whom are elected faculty representatives, which is responsible for the formulation of a balanced budget. This is one of the most powerful bodies in the University, and the president is only one of several ex officio administrative members.[41]

Just as other colleges are "catching up" to Roosevelt in terms of its curricula flexibility and concern for human rights, so also are others catching up to it in terms of its faculty's power. But Roosevelt was there early, and now has tradition in its favor in this area, too!

ADMISSIONS OVERVIEW

The admissions office at Roosevelt is under the direction of Mrs. Lily Rose, a long time staff member who offers an unusual combination. She seems to be as imaginative as she is devoted. With her small staff and cramped quarters, Mrs. Rose interviews applicants and visits secondary schools, community colleges, area employers, and other sources of new students. A faculty advisory committee considers new ideas and changing admissions policies.

At Roosevelt, student recruiting and counseling for course placement receive the greatest emphasis and are coordinated. Mrs. Rose's philosophy is that, "In recruiting and admissions we must remember that we are counselors and educators and not merely salesmen and businessmen."[42] The statement is not simple rhetoric, as efforts and results in Roosevelt admissions show. However, before reviewing these, a word should be said about Roosevelt's selectivity.

Selectivity can be measured in several ways, the most common of which are the SAT-Verbal scores of entering students, the secondary school class ranks of entering students, and the percentage of applicants admitted. None of these indicators is perfect, and each is fraught with hazards. How, for example, can one find a meaningful SAT-Verbal or class rank statistic for a college like Roosevelt that admits few eighteen year old freshman and many transfers and older students? The percentage of applicants admitted can also be misleading. The general decline in multiple applications has resulted in an increase in the percentage of students admitted by even the most selective schools. As better college guidance information has become available, students have been able to target their applications; preselection has taken place. Therefore, a college like Reed with an exceptionally talented student body (top decile) admits more than 80% of its self-selected applicants, while the School of Hotel Administration at Cornell University admits only one-fourth of the applicants from its less able and more diverse group. Consequently, we have to look at other data to determine Roosevelt's selectivity. Nevertheless, the few data available are suggestive. According to Barron's Profile of American Colleges, Ninth Edition (the latest), Roosevelt freshmen have a SAT-Verbal of 525, SAT-Math of 575, and ACT Composite score of 22. The ACT score is confirmed by Cass and Birnbaum's 1973 edition of their Comparative Guide to American Colleges. These scores place the Roosevelt freshmen who took the tests in the top third of all four-year freshmen. However, Cass and Birnbaum have not rated Roosevelt on their scale of selectivity, which means either that it is too complicated to rate or that it is considered by these authors to be unselective on their scale of Highly Selective, Very (+) Selective, Very Selective, Selective, and not rated.

In several ways, Roosevelt is a second choice, second chance institution, and therefore, not highly selective. For freshman applicants, the University competes with area public colleges and is a "safety school" for many local applicants to the private universities in the area. For transfer applicants, Roosevelt's sources are the local community colleges and Chicago-area residents who went away to school, but who for personal or financial reasons want to change, or who for academic reasons must start over again.[43] Most Roosevelt students are commuters. The 360 dormitory beds[44] are 90% full, but 50% of them are being used by students at neighboring colleges.

Table I shows the sources of students over a five-year period. It is interesting to note the continued shift away from mostly freshmen to transfers, and the shift away from out-of-state four year colleges as sources of students.

Table I

LAST SCHOOL ATTENDED PRIOR TO APPLICATION[45]
(EXCLUDING FOREIGN STUDENTS)

	Fall 69	Fall 70	Fall 71	Fall 72	Fall 73
City Colleges of Chicago	21	23	24	23	26
Illinois High Schools	26	27	28	27	22
Out of Illinois High Schools and High School GED	6	5	5	5	4
All Other Junior Colleges	7	13	11	11	14
University of Illinois-Chicago	3	3	3	3	4
Other Chicago Area four-year Schools	8	8	8	10	11
University of Illinois-Urbana	1	1	1	1	1
Northern and Southern Illinois Universities	3	3	2	2	3
Other Illinois four-year schools	5	3	3	3	3
Out of State four-year schools	18	13	13	13	11
USAFI, CLEP,& College GED	2	1	1	2	1
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

In recent years, the University has admitted about 80% of its applicants. Of the remaineder, 9.4% failed the entrance examination, 3.2% were rejected because of their previous academic performance, and 8.5% of the applications have been incomplete.[46] About 92% of transfer applicants were admitted.[47]

ADMISSIONS AND BARRIERS

The requirements for admission are simple, the deadlines generous. Applicants are advised that they may not be able to complete the admissions process if they file their papers after September 1 for a fall semester and after January 15 for a spring semester. These are liberal deadlines because classes begin in the middle of September and close to the first of February. Many colleges have deadlines of six to eight months before classes begin.

In addition to fifteen units of accredited secondary school work or passing General Education Development (GED) scores, freshman applicants also must submit either results of the Roosevelt University entrance examination or the results of one of the national college admission tests, the SAT or the ACT. Transfer applicants are admitted on the basis of their college work.[48]

The Revised Army Beta test, a non-language intelligence test, has been used with selected groups of applicants as a means for finding a more accurate reflection of ability than the national admission tests provide. Results have shown that foreign students who score near the bottom on the ACT have scored IQ results of 120, which is above average. This test is now being used with native populations who have had inadequate preparation in standard English. For transfers, the Cooperative School and College Ability Tests (SCAT) and Cooperative Reading Comprehension tests are frequently used.[49] This flexibility in testing is significant because it shows that Roosevelt is trying to diagnose the strengths and inadequacies of applicants, not just screen them out with a single composite score that hides variations in abilities. The SCAT is also used with some freshman applicants, most notably the early admissions students.

Applicants are notified of the admissions decision within seventy-two hours after the receipt of these records. The irony of this swift action is that some students learn that they have been admitted before they have even submitted their applications.[50]

Swift action and flexible class scheduling are not the office's only claims. Programs such as early admission after the junior year in high school, BOOST, Prime, General Studies, and others offer both flexibility and assistance to students. Brief descriptions of these programs follow.

1. Early Admission permits students who have completed the junior year of secondary school to enter college early.

2. Correspondence Study offers students the opportunity to study college-level courses without being in residence. This option may become a university without walls-type program.

3. The BOOST Program is co-sponsored by Roosevelt and area companies to attract and prepare for business careers minority students who would probably not otherwise attend.

4. The Adult Program Bachelor of General Studies is for students over age 25 and requires blocks of study rather than an accumulation of credits. For students with less than two years of college already completed, the requirements include (a) a six-semester-hour "pro-seminar" course which provides a review of basic skills, a diagnosis of future needs for course work, and the possibility of credit by examinations; (b) an area of concentration (about sixteen courses); (c) one six-semester-hour Senior Seminar in each of the three major groupings of knowledge: Man and His Social Environment, Man and His Physical Environment, and Man and His Cultural Environment; and (d) a three-semester-hour Internship in Community Service which involves both practical work in the community and reflecting upon that involvement with the help of a faculty member. An Alternate Program requiring at least thrity semester hours of upper level courses including the Internship exists for students who have already earned at least eighty credit hours.

5. Discovery is essentially a non-credit program of up to one year of testing and tutorial study that makes it possible for someone without a bachelor's degree to enter a master's degree program.

6. Basic Writing Practice is a diagnostic and clinical program for elementary training in writing.

7. The Study Improvement Program is offered by the Counseling and Testing Service to help students improve study methods.

8. The Reading Improvement Program offers special training in reading skills through a regular course.

9. The Reading Institute offers diagnostic testing and remedial tutoring in both reading and writing on an individual basis.

10. Reduced Tuition for senior citizens.

11. Upward Bound is a remedial program for students from the City of Chicago school system.

12. Sunday classes were first opened in spring of 1974. Fourteen classes enrolled 246 students, almost one-third of them new students.[51]

13. An interest in new programs such as Human Services, Urban Environmental Management, acturi.. sciences, and a lawyer's assistant program.[52]

14. Plans are underway for a satellite suburban learning center, the development of certificate programs and short courses in areas of applied knowledge, an external degree program, and a Master of General Studies program.[53]

These programs and plans have gone far to reduce the barriers to admission.

The Office of Admissions informs and counsels prospective students in a variety of ways. Of course it visits high schools (about 16 man-weeks per year throughout Illinois, Ohio, St. Louis, Indiana, and Nebraska) and community colleges, but it also uses other techniques to contact its potential population. Admissions counselors, faculty, and deans visit area businesses, women's groups, and cultural enrichment programs to tell them about the programs and opportunities at Roosevelt. In addition to personal visits, extensive use is also made of direct mail, newspaper advertising, posters, and free telephone service. Letters about admission and financial aid possibilities are sent to residents of area high rise apartments, recently discharged veterans, community groups, and those who in the past have requested information about Roosevelt but have not yet applied. Currently enrolled students are asked to name three others not already enrolled who are then sent letters from the president. Informal open houses are held for area community college students. Students are asked to bring a friend to campus. Advertising in suburban newspapers seems especially effective in recruiting students for the B.G.S. and M.B.A. programs available at the Glenview military base. Daycare is made available during the day at the base nursery.

During the past fifteen years, Roosevelt has worked closely with area military and naval bases at Fort Sheridan, Great Lakes, and Waukeegan. Serviceman and neighboring civilians alike take courses offered in base facilities. The most popular programs are the undergraduate degree in business and the master's programs in education and business.

"Phone power" is a relatively new service that offers admissions counseling over the telephone at designated hours. This and the other recruiting-counseling functions are carried out by a small staff on a limited budget. But the effects are impressive when one considers the service to area residents and the successful continuation of Roosevelt's ideals.

The financial barrier to further schooling is a serious one, not only in terms of direct costs, but also in terms of indirect costs such as foregone income. Roosevelt has been able to combine its own resources with state and federal funds to provide aid for a substantial number of her students, both full-time and part-time, regular term and summer, freshman and transfer. Almost all students who need aid receive it in some form, primarily because most students are from Illinois, a state which provides generous support to students at private colleges.[54]

In addition to local, state, and federal grants and loans, which in 1973-74 provided $3,413,352 in 3419 awards,[55] there are work-study arrangements with local industry, discounts for senior citizens, and a state program that provides $100 for each freshman and sophomore and $200 for each junior or senior state resident enrolled in private colleges and universities in Illinois.[56]

It is significant that Roosevelt provides aid to part-time students. More than a third of all colleges and universities do not,[57] and government grants are available only to full-time studnets. Roosevelt's commitment is substantial and rare.

Roosevelt's location near the center of a major city, with transportation nearby, and its branches in the outlying areas, make it accessible geographically as well as academically. In addition, its counseling services, curriculum, and special programs make it possible for Roosevelt to overcome the motivational barriers felt by many students. Roosevelt provides encouragement, assistance, and lots of information. Its bureaucratic barriers are few. It is known as a flexible, liberal place.

MEASURING THE DEGREE OF OPENNESS

Roosevelt is an interesting mixture of accessibility and high standards. It admits nearly all of its applicants and is not rated as selective, yet it has rigorous course requirements and a high rate of success by its transfer and General Studies students. More than 70% of freshman return for the sophomore year.[59]

Roosevelt University is in some ways the senior institution for Chicago's community colleges. C. C. students and the other, older students have created a bimodal grouping, with freshman direct from high school becoming a minority that shrinks in size each year. Attention must be paid to the pressures that are likely to result from this shift.

The barriers to postsecondary schooling exist in several forms: some are based in institutions, others are based in individuals. They are academic, financial, geographic, and motivational in nature. Roosevelt University is an interesting case of how a private institution can fight to diminish the effects of these barriers while it also strives to maintain its standards, and do both in the name of its founding fathers.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing has outlined and analyzed the organization and structure of college admissions, trends in the opening of admissions, and definitions that pertain to this new stage. In conclusion, a few words should be said about the implications of these changes for policies and procedures in higher education, especially as they effect institutions such as Roosevelt.

One can see how the demands of special programs and new students in this egalitarian era have affected the four core jobs of admissions. At private and public colleges alike, recruiting has intensified due to the pressure to enroll new groups of students. Counseling for course placement has become more important as fewer students are interested in traditional fields. And special attention to the selecting of students is needed as meritocratic criteria are challenged and, at times, set aside. In both public and private colleges, demands for accountability in the spending of federal and state financial aid funds has led to increased data management and reporting.

The barriers to post secondary schooling are falling, although not all at the same time and not all at once in the same institution. However, this case study shows, I think, that even a single, private college can do its part to effect dramatic social change in the opening of admissions.

This case has also shown that policies can be fair and procedures both humane and efficient, while at the same time they can accomplish the goals for which they were established. It is possible to have both open access and high standards, especially by providing the opportunity for access in steps according to individual achievement. That is, the key for the opening of admissions is the guarantee of mobility, not the promise of placement into a program that is beyond the scope of one's training and grasp. Equality and excellence are not mutually exclusive. There can be, and is, excellence in programs that admit anyone who wants to enter.

FOOTNOTES

1. Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971, p.1.

2. "Michigan Panel Named by Governor To Review State Higher Education." Higher Education and National Affairs, Volume XXII, Number 6, February 9, 1973, p.7.

3. Koch, Adrienne and William Peden, editors. The Life and Selected Writings of Thomas Jefferson. New York: The Modern Library, 1944, pp. 262-263.

4. Hofstadter, Richard and Wilson Smith, editors. American Higher Education, A Documentary History. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961, p.613, Volume II.

5. Ashby, Sir Eric. Any Person, Any Study, An Essay on Higher Education in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971, pp.101, 102.

6. Statement of the Board of Trustees, National Urban League, On Open Admissions in American Colleges and Universities. February, 1970, p.1.

7. Gardner, John. Excellence. New York: Harper and Row, 1961, p. 128.

8. Ibid., p. 85.

9. Ibid., p. 13; p.69. Also, Rawls, John. A Theory of Justice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971, p. 506.

10. Tetlow, William L. Jr., "Preliminary Investigations on the Academic Performance of Minority Group Students at Cornell University." Paper presented at A.A.A.S. Meeting, 1970.

11. Scott, Robert A. "Standards: Milestones or Barriers." Opinion. May 1970.

12. Ferrin, Richard. Barriers to Universal Higher Education. Palo Alto: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

13. See especially the numerous reports by William H. Sewell and Alexander Astin.

14. Anderson, C. Arnold, et.al. Where Colleges Are and Who Attends. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972. Ferrin, Richard I. A Decade of Change in Free Access Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971. Willingham, Warren W. Free-Access Higher Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

15. Cross, p.1

16. "Sir Eric Ashby on Mass Higher Education." The Chronicle of Higher Education, October 2, 1972, p. 8.

17. Holt, John. "The Radicalizing of a Guest Teacher at Berkeley". The New York Times Magazine, February 22, 1970, p.75. Also, The New Republic, July 5, 1969, p. 31, Letter to the Editor.

18. Quotations are from the plaque outside the University building and the Foreward to the Bulletin.

19. Much of the material in this section is based on "A Brief History of Roosevelt University," mimeo, 12/14/72.

FOOTNOTES

20. Clark, Burton R., The Distinctive College. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co. 1970, p.8.

21. Interview with Mrs. Alyce E. Pasca, May 18, 1973.

22. Interview with Dr. Lawrence Silverman, Dean of Students, May 18, 1973.

23. President's Annual Report, 1974, p.6.

24. Undergraduate Admissions Office Annual Report, 1973-74, pp. 16, 18, 20.

25. Interview with Mrs. Lily Rose, Director of Admissions, May 19, 1973.

26. The President's Annual Report, 1974, p.5.

27. "About Roosevelt", p.6.

28. The President's Annual Report, 1974, p.5.

29. Ibid, p.6.

30. Interview with Dr. Lawrence Silverman, Dean of Students, May 18, 1973, and Annual Report, 1973-74, Undergraduate Admissions Office, p. 22.

31. Computation based on data in Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, Ninth Edition, p. 217, and national data.

32. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1970 and 1960 Census of Population. For 1960, Volume 1. Part 15, p. 293. For 1970, Volume 1, Part 15, p. 872.

33. Interviews with Professor Otto Wirth, a "founding father" and former Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and James Hall, Acting Dean of the College of Continuing Education, May 18. 1973.

34. From a review of catalogs, reports, and an interview with Dr. James A. Hall, Acting Director of the College, May 17, 1973.

35. Interviews with Dominic Martia, Assistant to the President, November 11, 1974 and Lawrence Silverman, May 18, 1973.

36. Otto Wirth, May 18, 1973.

37. Roosevelt University Bulletin 74/75, pp 317, 318, 321, and 322.

38. Ibid., p. 324-325.

39. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1973 Edition, p. 87.

40. Data from the Chronicle of Higher Education, June 9, 1975, p.8.

41. "A Brief History of Roosevelt University," 12/14/72.

42. Annual Report 1973-74 Undergraduate Admissions Office, p. 1.

FOOTNOTES

43. Lily Rose Interview, December 13, 1972.

44. Lawrence Silverman, interview, May 18, 1973.

45. Annual Report, 1973-74, Undergraduate Admissions Office, p. 9.

46. Ibid. p. 13.

47. Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, Ninth Edition, p. 217.

48. Roosevelt University Bulletin 74/75 pp. 11 and 12.

49. Interview with Mrs. Rose, May 17, 1973.

50. Ibid.

51. President's Annual Report, 1974, p. 10.

52. Ibid., p. 13.

53. Ibid., p. 17.

54. Interview with Robert Franklin, Director of Financial Aid, December 14, 1972.

55. President's Annual Report, 1974, p. 9.

56. Higher Education in the States. Volume 5, number 1, 1975, p. 9.

57. Financing Part-Time Students: The New Majority in Post-secondary Education, American Council on Education, 1974.

58. Barron's Profiles of American Colleges, Ninth Edition, p. 217.

59. The College Blue Book, Midwest Regional Edition. New York: Macmillan Information, 1974, p. 28.